

Appl. No. : 10/797,211
Filed : March 10, 2004

SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW

Attendees, Date and Type of Interview

The interview was conducted on Tuesday, December 4, 2007 and attended in person by Examiner Laura Guidotti and attorney for Applicant, Marc T. Morley, and via telephone by inventor/Applicant, Philip J. Schaaf. Mr. Schaaf and Attorney Morley wish to again thank Examiner Guidotti for her generous time during the interview.

Exhibits and/or Demonstrations

Applicant showed a portion of an episode from America's Test Kitchen entitled "Rainy Day Barbeque," with a favorable third party mention of the George Foreman Grill® Sponge.

Identification of Claims Discussed

Independent Claims 21 and 43 were discussed.

Identification of Art Discussed

The art references cited in the pending Office Action were discussed, U.S. Patent No. 3,188,675 ("Beck"), U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0029967 ("McDonough"), and U.S. Patent No. 6,663,309 ("Zamansky et al.").

Proposed Amendments

Applicant agreed to amend Claim 28 to correct the antecedent basis for the claim and to amend Claim 24 to correct the typographical error of the sentence not ending with a period. Furthermore, Applicant agreed to amend Claim 43 as set forth above to clarify that the cleaning devices comprises, *inter alia*, "continuous, non-intersecting grooves that circumscribe each of said four faces."

Principal Arguments and Other Matters

Applicant and the Examiner discussed the differences between the prior art of record and the subject of the independent claims. In particular, the Examiner and Applicant discussed that Beck discloses a device having interrupted surfaces or "ridges" that are interrupted by perpendicular grooves and that Zamansky discloses a circular device lacking the features of the independent claims.

Appl. No. : **10/797,211**
Filed : **March 10, 2004**

Results of Interview

Applicant agreed to amend Claim 43 to further distinguish Beck. Applicant and the Examiner agreed that upon further analysis, Claim 21 did not require further amendment in view of Beck. The lack of obviousness of the claimed subject matter was also discussed in view of the art of record. Examiner Guidotti agreed to reconsider the rejections as discussed more fully below.